

## DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Office of the Director  
50 W. Gay St.  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040  
(614) 645-7795  
(614) 645-6675 (FAX)

**Tuesday, September 26, 2017**  
**77 N. Front Street, STAT Room (Lower Level)**

Planning Division  
50 W. Gay St.  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040  
(614) 645-8664

Downtown Commission  
Daniel J. Thomas (Staff)  
Urban Design Manager  
(614) 645-8404  
[djthomas@columbus.gov](mailto:djthomas@columbus.gov)

### **I. Attendance** 11:42

Present: Otto Beatty, Jr.(Vice Chair); Michael Brown; Tedd Hardesty; Robert Loversidge; Mike Lusk; Jana Maniace ; Danni Palmore

Absent: Steve Wittmann (Chair); Kyle Katz

City Staff: Daniel Thomas

### **II. Approval of the August 22, 2017 Downtown Commission Meeting Results**

Motion to approve (7-0)

### **III. Plan Briefing and Review**

#### **Case #1 17-9-1P** 12:30

**Location:** Discovery District

**Applicant** Discovery Special Improvement District / Cleve Ricksecker, Executive Director

**Design Professional :** MKSK

#### **Request:**

Briefing / review of plan to Commission.

*The SID does not intend on sending this to City Council. Specific items in the plan will be brought back to the Downtown Commission as necessary*

**Discussion:** Will come back for specific projects as necessary. Creating a vision and series of concrete steps. For strengthening the image of the Discovery District. Hundreds of people were consulted – residents, employees and visitors. Identifying the strengths – arts and culture, historic buildings; and weaknesses, parking lots, fractured connectivity. Key positive words – discovery, transformative, where contemporary meets history. Approach to placemaking – work within the public R.O.W., work with property owners, look at ways to fill empty spaces. Make pedestrian connections much stronger. Development of the Discovery Trail. Main Library, thru Topiary Park to Washington Ave. and entrance of the museum (about 1 mile). Park once and walk. Other potential project shown – mural opportunities on private property, including dressing up garages (describing institutions in the area with playful motifs), decorative crosswalks, directional signage. Reducing the length of the Broad Street crossing, particularly at major crossings.

OB – nature of plan approval of items going to City Council. CR – plan will not be

going to Council for improvements to private property. OB – where would people park? CR – weekend parking would be no problem. During workweek, parking is relatively easy. DP – funding? CR – We’re just starting. We might be back to the Commission in late 2018. Combination of public funding, private funding and SID funding. Also some pro bono. The SID will maintain public improvements. MB – thank you, we appreciate this visionary approach. Experience Columbus and GCAC are also working on art. Also, look at what’s happening on Long St. and all of its activity. CR – currently, downplaying that area because so much is emerging with Columbus State.

**Result:** Presentation only, no vote taken.

#### IV. Conceptual Review

**Case #2 17-9-2C**

**Address:** 230 E. Long Street

23:38

**Applicant and Design Professional :** Jonathan Barnes Architecture and Design

**Property Owner:** Charles Street Investment Partners LLC (Denver)

**Request:**

Conceptual Review for 6-story Mixed Use Building – Ground Floor Parking and Retail, Upper 5 Floors - Apartments

*Case was heard by the Commission in July 2017 on a conceptual basis. The current submission represents a further refinement.*

**Discussion:** JB – building plans and massing have been developing over the past two months. 235 units and commensurate parking and amenities. Flexible retail on the ground level along Long Street. .7 parking spaces per unit. “Donut” scheme floor arrangement. 6-story building. Site context given. Formerly a series of smaller buildings, now one massive parking lot. How to break up massing without being ersatz. Addressing scale issues. Doing it with shape, massing, materials, texture, colors roof shape and fenestration. Southwest corner is the most emphasized and is major entry. New elevations shown. A certain amount of irregularity. Use of different metal. Background pieces, some with stucco. Creating a palate of whites and grey tones. Accents of translucent balcony railings. Animating ground floor retail. Flexible space because retail can’t be forced. Possibility of converting some perimeter parking to retail. Possible use of semi-automated parking.

RL – consider art or other surface treatment for parking frontage along Long. JB – opportunity for some graphics major incorporating technology. Something that in a subtle way that would activate the street without being overwhelming. RL – question about general character of interior courtyard. JB – checking a few possibilities – green space – something for interior living units. RL – relate to color palate of surrounding buildings (not total contrast). JB – agree with issue. TH – consider streetscape and how important it is. Possible road diet. JM – transparency? JB – agree.

**Results:** Conceptual review only. No vote taken.

#### V. Certificate of Appropriateness

**Case #3 17-9-3**

48:00

**Address:** 220 E. Main Street

**Applicant:** Nicholas Kinney

**Design Professional:** SEM Architects

**Attorney:** David Dachner

**Property Owner:** Lev Kucherski

**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for the renovation of the second and third floors of two existing older commercial buildings into apartments.

**Discussion:** Contextual images shown. NK – Plans to put balconies on eastern and western facades. Additional drawings distributed showing how balconies would be attached. OB – questions about entrances and safety. Main entrances on Main (between the two buildings) and Fifth Streets. Wall sconces will be added. Plans and elevations shown. Windows, accommodating the balconies, will be added to the west façade. The one-story building to the west, is also owned by Lev's. Existing stairs – repair and replace, as needed. Bringing the building up to code and working with City Building. Covered walk ways in the light well, take up the differences in floor heights between the two buildings. Sections shown.

At one point, this was a furniture store. The upper floors have been vacant. Questions about the look of the balconies. "Industrial chic" is sought – galvanized (not painted). Lev's controls and owns the building to the west – no expansion planned there. RF – no first floor plan and lacks elevation of the Main Street façade, details of windows. NK – windows will be replaced. No action will be taken on first floor. Lev's signage is planned to be revised. MB – like this in intent and design. I don't know if there is enough detail for approval. RL – more information is needed. Project is great. Given us a lot of detail about what is happening inside, but. Inquiry about schedule. NK – getting ready to submit for review for permits, particularly construction for the interior. Reroofing portion of the building. RL – we could craft an approval to allow you to get those reviews underway while coming back to Commission with details – materials and color samples. More information about windows. Entryways. Everything looks good, but we need more for final approval. MB – motion to accept with the applicant to return with more detail regarding entryways, balconies, lighting plan, signage, windows. RL – 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Results:** Motion to approve, allowing applicant to proceed for building review. Applicant to return with more detail regarding entryways, balconies, lighting plan, signage, windows. (7-0)

**Case #4 17-9-4**

1:08:00

**Address:** 327 S. Washington Avenue

**Applicant, Property Owner & Attorney:** Sustainability Funding Alliance of Ohio, Inc.  
Sam Randazzo

**Architect:** Bruce Wisecarver, Architect

**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a detached garage for an existing house (circa 1880)

*In June 2015 the owner requested demolition of the house, which was turned down by the Downtown Commission.*

**Discussion:** Staff referred to the Discovery District's Southeast Gateway Plan which anticipates significant changes and development in the area due to hospital growth and the Mound Street off ramp. SR – fence around the property has been removed to improve visibility. Building will be brought back. Garage will protect cars and other property. Would like to start construction before

winter. Utilities dictate why garage is detached. Adjacent parcels are also owned by SR and have been used by neighboring auto service and is not part of this project. BW – hardiplank will be used. Light beige in color with a darker trim. Not a lot of other garages in area to base a comparison in style. There will be lights above the door. MB – a nice solution. RL – quite a turn around and we appreciate it. MB – motion to accept. RL -2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Results:** Motion to approve (7-0).

## **VI. Request for Certificate of Appropriateness for Advertising Mural (Temporary Graphic)**

### **Case #5 17-9-5M**

1:14:00

**Root Insurance ad mural**

**Address: 88 W. Mound Street**

**Applicant:** Outfront Media (OM)

**Property Owner:** Kemp, Schaeffer & Rowe, Co., L.P.A.

#### **Request:**

Design review and approval for installation of a vinyl mesh advertising mural to be located on the east elevation of 88 W. Mound Street. Proposed mural — Root Insurance Co. – “Better drivers get better rates”. There have been no prior ad murals at this site. CC3359.07(D).

*Proposals for this location were heard and **not** approved by the Commission in March and April of 2016. By the new Ad Mural legislation approved in March of this year, as a new location the Downtown Commission must approve both location and size, where upon it would become an administratively approvable item (provided it met percentage text and logo criteria).*

**Dimensions of mural:** 17’W x 29’H, two dimensional, non lit

**Term of installation:** Seeking approval for one month, October. 2 through 29, 2017

**Area of mural:** 493 sf      **Approximate % of area that is text and or logo:** 11%

**Discussion:** Staff mentioned the 9 cases that were administratively approved this past month because of preexisting locations. Proposal shown and part history given. Bail bondsman mural was turned down because of location, design and content. Proximity to courthouses and jails were a factor. New legislation has changed the content relevancy.

OM – artistic nature was also challenged. New mural is for local app based insurance company. OB – message and design is likeable. MB – this is still an untapped site. JM – not an appropriate site because of proximity to courthouses. OM – site is an attorney’s office. We already have restrictive lease with morals clause (part of packet). OM has seriously taken into consideration the design factor. And will continue to do. OB – absence of criteria to establish new locations. How to address. MB – it’s basically a yes or no on new locations. OB – would you like a vote on this or perhaps tabling? OM - Advertiser is scheduled to go up Nov. 2 so tabling would have impact. I thought that the major reason for the no a couple of years ago was the art, not the location. Looking to your guidance for what is acceptable for new location. We know there is a hesitancy to allow murals on walls with windows and the original spirit had to do with artistic content and dealing with building architecture. We’d like to have specific guidelines for what and where new locations should be. How would the Commission base its decision? DP – not conducive with all of the things going on in the vicinity. DT – traffic will increase when I-70 off and on ramps are complete. Volume of traffic on Mound will go up significantly. Last year the adjacent Marathon

gas station presented conceptual plans to rebuild so that the ad mural sit would largely be blocked. OM – if the location became obstructed, it wouldn't be used anymore. OB – concern is that once we approve this as a new location that there would be less control as to what goes up.

DT – no new murals have been approved since the new legislation went into effect in March 2017 and in July a “dormant” site renewal was requested (Key Bank at 88 E. Broad). OB – concerns with graphics around courthouses. JM – concern with unrestricted graphics. OM – brought lease agreement to show restrictions. We're restricting our own content to a higher standard. RL – motion to approve, MB – 2<sup>nd</sup>. OM – is there any process to hear new locations. New buildings, things go up and come down. Changes. OM is at a competitive disadvantage in that it has only a limited number of sites. How to move forward. Is it possible to have restrictive terms of erection. What constitutes a viable new location? RL – once we approve location the site becomes administratively approvable. OB – there is not a restriction in terms of applicant coming back. OM - I would like to have some general direction as to how to proceed. What is good or viable site? We know that it's not the artwork here because the artwork is going up elsewhere. DT – last 5 items of staff approvals are for Root ad murals on preapproved sites elsewhere in downtown. RL – suggests that our next Business Meeting deal with this topic. We all have the same concerns. Our jurisdiction has been severely curtailed. OB – involve the City Attorney as well. JM – appreciate the applicant's sensitivity. This has been a controversial site. OM – we would be happy to work with you. The new legislation did not say no new locations.

**Results:** Vote to approve (0-1-6) Hardesty abstaining. Motion fails

## VII. Business / Discussion

1:39:00

### Prior Cases

- Signage for Scioto Peninsula Park and Parking – opening in November 21min  
Motion to approve RL TH- 2<sup>nd</sup> (7-0) Should have ideally been on the regular agenda.
- Connector bridge between Hyatt and Convention Center – Project suspension of northern portion pending resolution of potential new hotel 1:54  
Report out
- Ebb & Float – N. Fifth St. – White wall as art mural –CCAD involvement  
Bring back when there is a design or to report.
- Scioto Peninsula  
Coming soon

### Public Forum

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last notification (August 18, 2017)

#### Ad Mural – ***Bold & Italics***

1. 216 E Main St – Painting Columbus on wall
2. ***106 N High St. – Pay Pal ad mural***
3. 64 E Broad St. – Mid-Ohio Food ad mural
4. 10 N. High St. – relocate channel 10 sign
5. ***145 N. High St. – Pay Pal ad mural***
6. ***274 S. Third St. – Coke ad mural***
7. ***154 N. Third St. – Reunite ad mural***
8. 415 N Front St. – Half Pint signage
9. 250 E Broad St- sidewalk and door improvements
10. 36 E Gay St. – Buckeye Bourbon House – sidewalk café

11. 248 S Fourth St. – Dirty Frank’s – Blade sign
12. 74 W Mound St. – relocate Marathon Oil sign
13. 254 S. Fourth St. – 16 Bit blade sign
14. 217 & 245 N. Grant Ave. – Faith Mission signs
15. 309 S Fourth St. –rooftop decks
- 16. 34 N. High St. N – Root Insurance ad mural**
- 17. 34 N. High St. S – Root insurance ad mural**
- 18. 64 E Broad St. –Root Insurance ad mural**
- 19. 274 S. Third St. – Root Insurance ad mural**
- 20. 100 E. Gay St. – Root Insurance ad mural**

**Next regular meeting will be on October 24, 2017, the fourth Tuesday of the month (four weeks away).**

**If you have questions concerning this agenda, please contact Daniel Thomas, Urban Design Manager, Planning Division at 614-645-8404.**

**1:59:00**